

REMARKS:

Claims 1-90 and 127-152 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 18, 19, 31, 33, 34, 48, 49, 61, 63, 78, 79, 128, 129, 134-139, and 142 have been amended. Claims 2, 6-17, 20-30, 32, 36-47, 50-60, 62, 64-77, 80-127, 130-133, 140, 141, and 143-152 were canceled. Claims 153-159 were added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-5, 18, 19, 31, 33-35, 48, 49, 61, 63, 78, 79, 128, 129, 134-139, 142 and 153-159 are now pending in this application.

Specification Objections

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the recitation of “processor.” While Applicant vigorously disagrees with this objection (see Fig. 2 and supporting disclosure in Applicant’s specification), to advance prosecution toward an allowance, Applicant has amended the claims to remove the term “processor.” Applicant submits that such amendments have been made in a manner that does not narrow the scope of the claims.

Section 101 Rejections

The § 101 rejections of claims 31-60 are believed moot, either because these claims have been amended (to remove the term “processor”) or because these claims have been canceled.

The Examiner further rejected claims 61-90, 129-138, 145-152 as being software claims “directed to non-statutory subject matter.” *See* Office Action at 3. Applicant disagrees with these rejections, but, to advance prosecution, has nevertheless either canceled these claims, or has amended these claims to refer to “tangible” computer readable media. Applicant submits that such amendments render moot any perceived problem with § 101.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-7, 10, 31, 36, 37, 40, 61, 66-67, 70, 127-137, 139, 140, 142-147, 149, and 151 under U.S.C. § 102 based on Lalonde et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,072,944. Applicant submits that various amended independent claims each refer to a “web page.” Applicant further submits that because Lalonde includes no teaching or suggestion of, for example, “making a determination of the likelihood that a first web page received from a first computer network is misrepresented as being from a trusted source” (see amended claim 1), Lalonde does not anticipate any claims referring to a “web page.” Applicant therefore submits that the instant amendments render the § 102 rejections of claim 1 and its dependents moot. The § 102 rejections of independent claims 31, 61, 129, and 139 and their respective dependent claims are believed moot for reasons similar to those provided for claim 1.

With respect to claim 134 and its dependent claims, Applicant submits that Lalonde does not teach or suggest the use of “an age of the received data, and/or a size of the received data” to “make a determination whether the received data indicates that it is from a first source coupled to the external network, but is actually from a second source coupled to the external network,” as recited in claim 134. Applicant therefore requests removal of the § 102 rejections with respect to claim 134 and its dependents.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected a number of claims under U.S.C. § 103 based on Lalonde in view of Toomey, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0078422. Applicant traverses these rejections and submits that the rejections are either moot (because such claims have been canceled) or have been overcome based on the present amendments.

Toomey is directed to “detecting spoofed login pages and determining and executing an appropriate course of action to prevent spoofers from obtaining users’ login IDs and passwords via the spoofed login pages.” Toomey (Abstract). As such, Toomey’s sole apparent means of detecting spoofing is determining whether “the page contain[s] a form with input elements that could be used for login ID + password.” *See id.* at ¶ [0034]. Accordingly, Toomey does not teach or suggest “determining that the first web page includes content associated with a request

for a financial account number of a user of the information handling system,” as recited in claim 1. Because Lalonde is not even concerned with “web pages,” neither reference teaches this feature of amended claim 1.¹ Claim 1 and its dependents are thus believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 31 and 61 and their respective dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance for reasons similar to those provided for claim 1.

With respect to claim 129, Applicant submits that Toomey appears only to identify a web page as “being a possible spoof” or not being a possible spoof. *See* Toomey ¶¶ [0035]; [0041]. Accordingly, Toomey does not teach or suggest “categoriz[ing] a web page received via an external network interface of the information handling as spoofing its origin, not spoofing its origin, or indeterminate as to whether the received web page is spoofing its origin,” as recited in claim 129. Applicant thus submits that claim 129 is patentably distinct over the cited references, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Still further, Toomey appears merely to assess one or more hyperlinks of a spoofing web page and whether the page contains input elements. It does not appear to analyze additional information relating to the web page. *See* Toomey ¶¶ [0029]-[0035]. Accordingly, it cannot be said that Toomey teaches or suggests “wherein the determination is based, at least in part, on an age of the received data, and/or a size of the received data,” as in amended claim 134. Applicant thus submits that claim 134 and its dependent claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Claim 155, its dependent claims, and claim 159 are believed to be in condition for allowance for similar reasons.

For this reason, Toomey also cannot be said to “send[]data to the web page that is requested by the web page” and to “analyz[e] the origin’s response to the sent data to determine whether the origin of the received web page is the first source” as in claim 139. Claim 139 and its dependent are therefore believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references for at least this reason, and in condition for allowance.

¹ While Lalonde discloses that a recipient of a spoofed email may “furnish confidential information such as bank account details, credit card details, personal detail, or the like,” *see* Lalonde at 3:4-6, Lalonde does not determine whether an email actually contains a request for such information.

Still further, Toomey also does not teach or suggest “determining that the layout of the web page is similar to a layout of a known mistrusted web page,” as in claim 153. Claim 153 and its dependent claim are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 158 is believed to be in condition for allowance for similar reasons.

For at least the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the § 103 rejections.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6002-00701/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2008

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847